



DEPARTMENT OF
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
LONG RANGE PLANNING

MEMORANDUM

TO: Citizens and Interest Groups of Clark County
CC: Board of Clark County Commissioners
FROM: Patrick Lee, Long Range Planning Manager
DATE: January 17, 2001
SUBJECT: Vacant Lands Model Issues and Concerns
CASE NUMBER: Plan Monitoring Task Force

Since the publication of the Plan Monitoring Report in July of 2000, several issues have been raised in regards to the mapped parcels and the recent criteria and assumptions established by the Plan Monitoring Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). In a letter to Clark County GIS, dated September 20, 2000, regarding Clark County vacant and buildable lands, the Responsible Growth Forum (RGF) request clarification on a series of issues. The purpose of this memorandum is to address the concerns raised by the RGF and others as they relate to the vacant lands model.

Below each issue raised by RGF and others is restated along with results of a county investigation of the issue and how the problem, if one existed, is addressed in the January 2001 vacant and buildable lands model.

Issues Noted by RGF

1. *Tax exempt and state-assessed properties (churches, schools, transit, etc.) appear as Underutilized on all three maps (residential, commercial, industrial).*

Response: This is a problem for the residential underutilized category and stems from the model coding used to identify underutilized lands. When the definition of residential underutilized changed, and treatment of underutilized residential changed with regard to critical lands as a result of PMTAC recommendations, the order of operations in the model needed to correctly apply the new criteria were not implemented.

In the January 2001 model run tax exempt or state assessed parcels are no longer included in the underutilized category, even if they otherwise meet that definition.

2. *Single use, multiple parcel properties. - "assessed with" - are not adjusted. The Orchards Fred Meyer store is an example.*

Response: As these parcels are identified they can be placed in the "assessed with" model over-ride file.

In the January 2001 model run the "assessed with" table has been updated to the latest information provided by the Assessor, which is updated weekly.

3. *The Technical Advisory Committee changed how Type 1 and Type 2 critical lands would be addressed in the mapping model. It does not appear that the maps reflect these critical land exclusions.*

Response: The critical lands are being applied as defined by the PMTAC in the model. We will check the output, including maps, to make sure that the map legends are consistent with the revised classification.

In the January 2001 model run one change has been made that relates to this concern. Because of order of operations in the model parcels with critical lands greater than 50% were classified slightly differently for vacant and underutilized lands. In the vacant lands category, these parcels were explicitly assigned a different classification. In the residential underutilized category, these parcels retained the same classification but carried an attribute that distinguished them as having greater than 50% critical. When the reports showing the total acreage were run, they would query this underutilized attribute to properly account for the underutilized acreage available for development. However the map-building amls only queried the larger underutilized classification, which included parcels with critical lands greater than 50%. In summary, some of the parcels identified on the maps were shown with an underutilized classification, when they should have carried a critical exclusion classification; however the residential underutilized acreage reported in the July 2000 Plan Monitoring report did not include this as inventory. In the January 2001 run, underutilized with critical greater than 50% are explicitly classified.

4. *Mobile Home Parks are coded as Underutilized. In 1994, they were considered a residential use.*

Response: Mobile home parks were coded as underutilized in the most recent model run.

In the January 2001 model run mobile home parks are treated exactly the same as all other residential parcels. In the 1994 model mobile home parks were excluded because there were personal property and not real property. Today assessor data does support the evaluation of mobile home parks just as any other residential parcel, so there is no need for specialized treatment.

5. *It appears the buffers for DNR streams are not turned on in the model.*

Response: They are.

GIS Research Results:

Map review by GIS staff has confirmed that DNR Streams are contained in the critical lands data sources and are being buffered according to the following matrix. This is consistent with the definitions of critical lands established by GMA and revised by the TAC.

From Coverage DNRHYD

water.type	buffer distance
1	250 ft
2	250 ft
3	200 ft
4	150 ft
5	150 ft
9	NOT buffered

In the January 2001 model run, no change is made. The buffers have previously been implemented correctly. However, this concern may be related to and addressed by issue 3 above.

6. *CREDC's Industrial Lands Committee provided a list of individual parcel errors noted from their review of the industrial maps.*

*Response: In 1994 the industrial lands inventory was established by implementing CREDC-developed criteria in the model **and** by applying a manual override file provided by CREDC when model results failed to produce the expected result.*

GIS Research Results:

The lists of parcels identified by CREDC include many changes to the industrial model. Many of these parcels will have to be re-classified with the use of an override file. The override file needs to be used for several reasons. Among these are to address issues in the assessor's database. The assessor does not record a building value for tax exempt industrial parcels. This creates a problem in identifying the vacant industrial parcels that are tax exempt. Further complicating the issue is the fact that some vacant tax-exempt industrial parcels, such as the Port of Vancouver, should be identified as primary, secondary, or tertiary vacant industrial parcels-not as tax-exempt parcels.

Some parcels identified by CREDC need to have their classification changed, due to refinement in the planning criteria. This will affect the classification on secondary vacant industrial parcels.

Current Criteria:

Primary Building value LT \$67,500, within 500' of sewer, at least 10 acres and LT 10% critical.
Secondary Building value LT \$67,500, at least 5 acres, 10% to 50% critical lands.
Tertiary Building value LT \$67,500, at least 5 acres, up to 100% critical lands.

Proposed Criteria:

Primary Building value LT \$67,500, within 500' of sewer, at least 10 acres and LT 10% critical.
Secondary Building value LT \$67,500, at least 5 acres, 0 % to 50 % critical lands.
Tertiary Building value LT \$67,500, at least 5 acres, up to 100% critical lands.

This change will prevent a vacant parcel between 5 and 10 acres, with less than 10% critical land, as being classified as Tertiary, when it should be classified as Secondary.

The change outlined above was implemented in the January 2001 model run.

7. *Powerline easements are reflected in the residential map, but not on the commercial and industrial maps.*

Response: This is correct. The model should remove known/identified easements and rights-of-way from the buildable commercial and industrial inventory.

GIS Research Results:

In the VLM, easements are only evaluated and classified in the residential model. This is consistent with the criteria and assumptions developed in 1994 and modified in 2000 by the TAC.

Chamber of Commerce Issue From November 28, 2000 Letter to Pat Lee:

1. *“ 1999 criteria include a blanket assumption that any parcel assessed with a residential use in a commercial zone will go to the underutilized category. In the 1999 inventory this accounts for approximately 542.5 acres”.*

Response: Criteria for commercial vacant and underutilized will be applied uniformly, regardless of existing land use.

Currently residential building present on commercial or industrial lots define the property as underutilized, regardless of value of the building. We could not find any documentation relating to this assumption. Recommendation is to consider the value of the residential building in making the determination.

The January 2001 model run treats all commercially designated lands the same, regardless of use—there is no longer a residential use override.

City of Vancouver Issue From October 19, 2000 Letter to Clark County Planning Commission:

1. *“ Formal Request for Clark County to Update 38% Land Factor to Realistic Number. The City of Vancouver analyzed the actual land use development patterns on four square miles of land within the City and found that a factor of 28% realistically represents the amount of land that should be removed from gross land area to determine the net buildable land area.”*

Response: As part of Plan Monitoring Report Technical Advisory (TAC) process, RGF and FOCC met with Clark County BOCC and agreed to a 38% infrastructure deduction which includes consideration of both internal and external infrastructure needs. (this factor is applied once to all vacant lands without regard to size of lot).

The infrastructure factor is not part of the model run, but is a planning assumption that may be applied to the results. As such, this issue is not addressed as part of the January 2001 model run.

CREDC

CREDC has published the “Report to Clark County on Current Industrial Land Inventory”. This document provides both an estimate of the existing inventory. a calculation of need based on anticipated growth, and policy recommendations for economic development. This current process only addresses the identified inventory, and we hope that the parcel-specific adjustment (see above) provided in the manual override file will address any inconsistency between county-identified inventory and the CREDC report.

In the January 2001 model run, no additional industrial manual override has been applied. County staff still has to review CREDC comments parcel by parcel in order to place them in an override file.

Other Issues

One other important issue has come to the attention of staff. The GIS model was constructed to be run on either comprehensive plan designation or on zoning designation. For the past couple of years the residential model has been run on the zoning GIS layer while the commercial and industrial models have been run using comprehensive plan designations. This separate treatment leads to one specific and identifiable result, which will be addressed in subsequent model runs. Parcels that are currently zoned commercial or industrial but carry a residential comp plan designation are not included in the inventory, regardless of how they would otherwise be classified. In the latest residential model run, this accounted for approximately 500 acres. It is very likely that once all of the model classification criteria are applied to these parcels only a relatively small amount of land would be added to the inventory. Nonetheless, in all subsequent model runs all three models—residential, commercial, and industrial, will all be run using comprehensive plan designation, so there will be no remainder.